DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 519 CE 014 927

AUTHOR Kapel, David E.
TITLE Career Education Training and the Role Perceptions of Cooperating Teachers toward the Field Experience.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 49p.; Paper presented at the Eastern Educational Research Association Meeting (Williamsburg, Virginia, March 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; College Supervisors; *Cooperating Teachers; *Decision Making; Educational Research; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; *Preservice Education; Program Administration; *Role Perception; Student Teaching; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Educators; Teacher Participation; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine the role level of cooperating teachers in decision making in teacher education field experiences and their attitudes about the role they wish to play. Information was gathered using an opinionnaire mailed to 175 cooperating teachers in elementary, secondary, and K-12 education levels involved in the 1976-77 University of Nebraska (Omaha) student teaching semester. In addition, university faculty involved in field experiences were surveyed in terms of their perceptions of the cooperating teachers' role. Findings were analyzed and compared to the 1975 Bush study conducted in an East Coast urban area. It was found that there was a difference in perception of the present and the desired level of role involvement, but the difference was not great. As in the Busy study, findings indicated that cooperating teachers did not desire a dramatic increase in involvement; and in terms of the two distinct geographic locations, no dramatic differences or increases in role perceptions were identified. It appears that college supervisors do not see as great a need to increase the level of decision making involvement of cooperating teachers as do the teachers themselves. If career education experiences are to be maximized for future teachers, then there is a need to change cooperating teachers' attitudes toward the field experience as it is presently structured. Emphasis should be placed on the cooperating teachers seeing themselves in relationship to content, subject matter, techniques, and methodology rather than as providers of a "place" to have the field experience. (TA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED151519

CAREER EDUCATION TRAINING AND THE ROLE PERCEPTIONS OF COOPERATING TEACHERS TOWARD THE FIELD EXPERIENCE[1]

David E. Kapel
Associate Dean of
Instruction & Research
Professor of Education
University of Nebraska
at Omaha

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David E. Kapel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Paper presented at the Eastern Educational Research Association Meeting in Williamsburg, Virginia, March, 1976.

. . . . . .

[1]The authors wish to acknowledge the initial research in this area by Dr. Ann G. Bush, Assistant to the Superintendent of Schools, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The research could not have been completed without her kind permission allowing the author the use of the instrument she developed.

CE 014 927

There is an abundance of information - some of it jointly developed for the college supervisor and cooperating teacher, dealing with in-class supervision of student teachers and the related perfunctory responsibilities of both. Such topics as evaluation, conference tactics, observation strategies, and the like abound in the literature. For excellent guidance in supervision and evaluation, one may refer to the work of Perrodin (1966), Clothier and Kingsley (1973), DuBey, Endly, Rae and Tollett (1975), Toney and Dieterle (1976), and Copeland (1977). All of these provide sound examples of the newer directions in cooperating teacher/student teacher interaction as well as research of techniques used by cooperating teachers in helping student teachers. Publications of this nature and the countless number of college prepared manuals and handbooks serve a valuable function in the field component of teacher education. Most, however, do not treat the issue of policy and joint decision making processes between the college and classroom. That is, they do not address the existing (but possibly latent) perceptions that may exist among the ranks of cooperating teachers in terms of shared responsiblity in teacher education.

Perhaps, through the historical development of modern teacher education programs, the university has assumed that what cooperating teachers are doing is precisely what they want to do and any added involvement in decision making and policy formulation would not hold any appeal for them. Higgins (1971) suggests that some discord does, in fact, exist since many teacher education institutions have overlooked the school community to a large extent in the planning for professional education - especially as such planning involves the student teaching component. Teachers, because of training, tradition, and experience may believe that major program decisions at the pre-service level have and will continue to be made for them by some external authority such as the college, state department or school

district (Wayson, 1974). As a result, teachers generally will agree to function on a level of minor decision making. The classroom management guidelines which are abundantly available to cooperating teachers are good examples of Wayson's position. That is, such aides are normally prepared by the sponsoring institution - given to the teacher and either used or disposed of without question. Cooperative policy and decision making efforts between the school and university may not be evident in terms of field programs due to stresses, among which is the historical tendency of the university to concern itself with theory and research to the exclusion of the school's practical operational problems in field programs (Tom, 1973).

Perhaps suggestive of role conflicts, Southworth (1968) calls for a partnership to be developed which would allow teachers to freely express their needs and ideas to the university power structure. Alton Huntley (1973) maintains that, to reduce the image of the college as assuming the superiority posture or dictatorial role in this joint mission of teacher education, more must be done to insure increased cooperating teacher consultation in planning for field experiences. No single faction (Cottrell, 1974) associated with teacher education (college, school, state department) can assume the dominant role. All have valid contributions to make. The education of teachers should take place under the jurisdiction of the college - but not to the exclusion of others. This is particularly true as it affects planning and decision-making in clinical experiences. Components that contribute to pre-service education -- teacher educators, teachers, and administrators -- have not really worked together to strengthen teacher education programs (Knipsel, 1974). Visibility of individual units - not cooperation and teamwork - seems to be the current trend. This has been demonstrated by the political pressures and counter-pressures exerted at the national and

state levels over Teacher Centersand state teacher certification control. Dressel (1970) feels that student teaching (the major clinical experience in most pre-service education programs) is the single most important component in the pre-service education of teachers and calls for the continuous cooperative effort between the classroom teacher and teacher preparation institutions to improve it.

In the past few years there has been an increase in the number of workshops, clinics, and seminars for cooperating teachers; even an advanced graduate degree program in the supervision of student teachers has been proposed (Horton, 1977). Generally, these activities are offered or sponsored by teacher education institutions or national professional organizations. Frequently, these activities restrict themselves to the immediate and practical concerns of the cooperating teacher, but generally are not concerned with the decision making process. However, these functions could provide additional means for the needed activities that could include collaborative policy formulation, goal setting and decision making for the field experiences. Much of the descriptive literature dealing with teacher education suggests that the cooperating teacher is a major resource in the professional education of teachers. Yet, the literature says little in terms of their responsibilities and value as contributory planners, goal-setters, policy and decision makers in the field experience component. The latter still appears to remain in the exclusive domain of the teacher preparation institutions. The question of whether cooperating teachers wish to alter their restricted decision making role in the field experience remains. For the cooperating teacher is a major part of the field experience, hence a need to explore their needs and wishes.

A survey by Sadler (1974) reports that student teachers in Secondary

Education relied more heavily on their cooperating teacher in contrast to the university supervisor for direction in student teaching. In this same survey, cooperating teachers indicated that there did not exist any framework by which they could provide assistance as it related to program design or program policy. Moreover, Bush (1975) investigated the perceived and desired role of cooperating teachers in decision making related to the field experience. Although there appeared to be a need to change the conditions of decision making, a need for extensive participation was not desired. The Sadler survey, the study by Bush, and the paucity of data in this area have provided the motivation for the thrust of this investigation - the determination of the level of the role of cooperating teachers in decision making in the field experience; their respective attitudes about the role they wish to play.

PURPOSES OF STUDY:

The purposes of this investigation were to:

1. Gather information from cooperating teacher groups (Sec. Ed., K-12, El. Ed.) in a Mid-west medium size urban community (Metropolitan Omaha, Nebraska) as it related to their role in field experiences. In addition, university faculty involved in field experiences were surveyed in terms of their perceptions of the cooperating teacher's role.

2. Determine, if any, the discrepancies that might exist between the role of cooperating teachers as they presently perceived that role and what they perceived their role "should be."

3. Determine whether college supervisory faculty perceptions differ from those of cooperating teachers.

4. Determine to what extent the factors of the Bush Study can be replicated in a different geographic locale and environment; and whether cooperating teacher and university faculty perceptions of cooperating teachers' role in field programs differ due to geographic setting (i.e. a large East Coast Urban area versus a smaller Mid-west urban community).

5. Relate the results to what teacher trainers at the university level can expect with regard to Career Education through the cooperating teacher in the field experience.

PROCEDURES:

All 175 cooperating teachers involved in the 1976-77 University of Nebraska at Omaha student teaching semester were surveyed by means of a mailed opinionnaire.* UNO supervisory faculty were also surveyed. The overall cooperating teachers' percent of return of 80.57 (N=141) was sufficient to permit inferences to be made to the total population as well as sub-populations (Sec. Ed. - 78%, N=39; K-12 - 76%, N=38; El. Ed. - 85.3%, N=64) of cooperating teachers involved in the student teaching field experience offered by the University to pre-service education majors. The percent of return of 57.90 (N=11) from faculty would not allow inferences without caution to the total supervisory faculty who are involved in the student teaching experience.

The opinionnaire was mailed to the cooperating teacher population and university supervisory faculty and returned anonymously. The instrument used was a revision of the Bush (1975) opinionnaire originally sent to cooperating teachers in a large eastern metropolitan area. The only revisions to the Bush instrument were those necessary to fit the Omaha area (e.g. name of institution, name of city, etc.). The opinionnaire contained thirty-two items to which the respondent indicated his/her perception of role as it is presently ("What Is") and what it ideally should be ("What Should Be") using a modified Likert scale of 1 - No Involvement to 3 - Some Involvement to 5 - Total Involvement.

In order to interpret the findings better and to compare them with the 1975 Bush Study, the Alpha Factoring Technique (Nie, et.al. SPSS, 1975, p.481) with varimax rotation (Kaiser, 1958) of factors with eigenvalues > 1.00 was used to determine the number and nature of the factors that could be isolated and identified. Alpha factoring maximized generalizability, consequently, the factors that are retained have high reliability (alpha reliability). The Alpha factor analyses with the varimax rotations were claculated on the responses of the cooperating teachers to the items in terms of the "What Is" and

---

*Most of the cooperating teachers at the elementary and K-12 levels were involved in some type of Career Education program. Ten of the Sec. Ed. cooperating teachers were vocational or Business Ed. Teachers.

then the "What Should Be" conditions of the instrument. Following a procedure similar to Terenzini and Pascarella (1977), mean factor scale scores were computed for each respondent. This was accomplished by summing the raw scores on variables with rotated factor loadings of .40 and above on a particular factor, then dividing the sum by the number of variables involved. If a variable had loadings of .40 or above on two or more dimensions, the variable was included in the computation of scores for that factor on which it had the higher loading. This procedure, as indicated by Armor (1974), will increase the alpha reliability. The factors were then used in additional analyses (T-test of Correlated Means) to determine if there existed a difference between "What Is" and "What Should Be" for each classification of cooperating teacher (Sec. Ed., K-12, El. Ed.) and for university supervisory faculty (university faculty responses were not included in determining the factors).

Two-way analyses of variances with teacher and faculty groups comprising main effect A and repeated measures (factor scale scores generated by the factor analyses) being main effect B were used to determine if there existed differences among groups (Winer, 1971: p. 525). The F ratios on the main effect A and main effect B were treated as multivariate F's. A Scheffé multiple range test (Scheffé, 1969) was used to isolate specific group differences where significant differences were found.

FINDINGS

On a 1 to 5 scale, none of the items found in the instrument generated a mean higher than 3.29 for cooperating teacher perceptions of "What Is." This was, however, not true for their perceptions of "What Should Be"; the largest mean that was generated was 3.91 under the ideal condition. Although on many items there were mean differences between their perceptions of "What Is" and "What Should Be" - with the ideal generating higher means, most of

the cooperating teacher groups saw their role operationally (presently) to be from "No Involvement" to "Slight Involvement" with few exceptions (only 20% of the means were above 2.00), and they saw the "Should Be" level of involvement to be between "Slight Involvement" and "Some Involvement" (with two-thirds of the means between 2.50 and 3.50). Faculty respondents in the study viewed the cooperating teachers role as it presently "Is" (with one-third of the means generated above 2.00) to be slightly higher than the role viewed by cooperating teachers. The faculty did not view a need for as high an "ideal" role of involvement for cooperating teachers as did the cooperating teachers themselves; in terms of "What Should Be," 59% of the item means generated by the college faculty were between 2.50 and 3.50; the highest being 3.67.

ANALYSES BASED ON PRESENT ("WHAT SHOULD BE") CONDITIONS

Initially eight factors (Table I) that met the Wilks' Lambda Criterion of 1.00 or better were isolated from the data collected from the responses to the "What Is" section of the instrument. These eight factors accounted for 71.9% of the total variance generated by the respondents (all cooperating teachers). It should be noted that of the 8 factors, Factor #1 produced the largest amount of variance of any of the factors - 36.1%. These factors were then rotated using the varimax rotation procedure. All eight factors were rotated, thus creating eight orthogonal factors. Inspection of the varimax rotated factor structures enabled an identification (naming) of the eight factors (refer to Table II).

Insert Tables I and II About Here

Factor 1, that produced 54.7% of the variance of the total rotated factors, was a General Administrative/Organizational factor. Factor 2 (which produced 13.4% of the variance) was designated as an Orientation and Preparation factor. Factor 3 (that produced 7.8% of the variance) was designated as an Evaluation factor. A Structure factor was identified as the fourth factor.

This factor generated 7.3% of the total variance that was generated by the rotated factors. Factor 5 (which produced 5.6% of the variance) was a Routine Practices/Procedures factor. A Field Program Design factor that generated 4.3% of the variance was identified as the 6th factor. Factor 7 (which generated 3.5% of the variance) was named a Site/Staff factor and Factor 8, that generated 3.3% of the variance, was labeled a Field Director Relations factor.

Questions 16 and 26 did not load on any of the factors and appear to be quite independent. The factor analysis suggest that these two items should be excluded from the analysis. These items - "define criteria for the selection of teacher education students" (#16), and "defining follow-up course activities for student teachers" (#26) - obviously involve activities which preceed and proceed cooperating teacher present contact with field programs.

Insert Table III About Here

The varimax rotated factor scale scores were then used as the dependent variables in a two-way analysis of variance with cooperating teachers and faculty groups comprising main effect A, and the main effect B being repeated measures on the eight factors. The F ratios generated were treated as though they were multivariate F's. Where significant F ratios did occur, the Scheffé multi-range test was used to determine specific group differences.

The means generated for each of the factors (calculated from scale scores) as the cooperating teachers and faculty view the cooperating teachers' role in the field experience program presently ("Is") and what it "Should Be" appear in Table IV. The means were below 2.0000, with the exceptions of Factor 5 (Secondary Ed., K-12, Elementary Education) and Factors 2 and 5 (Faculty), for the present conditions of decision making. Except for Factor 8 (Secondary Ed., K-12, Elementary Ed., and Faculty) that is below 2.0000, all the means under the ideal ("What Should Be") condition ranged from 2.1635 to 3.7576.

Insert Table IV About Here

In terms of what is viewed as the present status of the cooperating teacher roles based on the eight factor scale scores, there were significant differences generated between groups (main effect A), $F=4.8604$, $p=.006$, and factors (main effect B), $F=20.5168$, $p < .0001$. In addition, there was a significant interaction between groups and factors, $F=3.0326$, $p < .0001$ (refer to Table V).

Insert Table V About Here

In the repeated measures analysis of "What Should Be" these roles, only the factors (main effect B), $F=21.3037$, $p < .0001$ generated a significant difference (Table VI). There were no group significant differences or significant interactions.

Insert Table VI About Here

Post Hoc tests on the significant differences that were generated in the analysis of variance for "What Is" (Table V) indicates that the Secondary Cooperating Teachers responded similarly to the Elementary Education Cooperating Teachers, while the K-12 Cooperating Teachers responded similarly to the Faculty group across all factors except one (Factor 5). It should be noted that the Elementary Education and Secondary Cooperating Teachers saw their present role to be statistically less significantly involved than did the K-12 and Faculty groups.

For main effect B, factors across groups for the "What Is" segment of the instrument, Factors One and Eight generated significantly lower scores than all of the other factors. Factors 3, 4, 6, & 7 were equal while factor 2 was significantly higher than these factors, and that factor 5 was significantly higher than all of the other factors. That is, across groups,

the respondents saw themselves more involved presently with practices and procedures (Factor Five) than the other seven factors. Teachers and faculty viewed that there was little involvement in the factor that was most important, i.e. Factor 1 (the factor that generated the largest amount of variance). The greatest amount of involvement occurred with a relatively less important factor - Factor 5.

The significant interaction was isolated to have occurred on Factor Five: with the Faculty and Secondary Education Cooperating Teachers responding similarly; Elementary Education had a significantly higher response than the Faculty and Secondary Education groups; and the K-12 teacher group generating a significantly higher response than all of the other groups.

The results indicate that there was no significant group difference across factors in terms of "What Should Be" (Table VI). In addition, there were no significant interactions.

Post Hoc tests on main effect B (factors) for "What Should Be" indicates that Factor Eight is significantly less prized than Factor One, and that these two factors are less prized than Factors 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7 (Factors 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, & 7 are prized by the respondents equally). If one were to refer back to Table IV, it is obvious that the respondents feel that they should have more of a role in the field experience than they presently have; although the means for these factors by and large were between 2.0 "slight involvement" and 3.0 "some involvement." Presently, they see little involvement in the process. Respondents did not feel that there should be considerable involvement in the major factor (Factor 1). They saw greater involvement for cooperating teachers in the factors that did not account for as much variance under the present conditions of field experiences.

In order to determine whether there were significant differences between the "What Is" responses and the "What Should Be" responses, T-Test for

Correlated Means were calculated, based on the eight scaled scores, for each group (refer to Table VII). All of the teacher groups felt that they should have significantly more input into the areas, as defined by the factors, than they presently have. It is interesting to note that faculty, on the other hand, did not see as much of a need to change the degree of input cooperating teachers have in the field experience program as it presently exists. Only four of the factors (1, 3, 4, & 8, Table VII) generated a significant difference between the "What Is" and "What Should Be" for the faculty.

Insert Table VII About Here

ANALYSES BASED ON THE IDEAL ("WHAT SHOULD BE") CONDITIONS

The data was reanalyzed using responses under ideal ("What Should Be") conditions. The purpose for reconsidering the data was to determine if respondents felt that their decision making role would be different if they could formulate the role rather than react to present conditions.

The procedure used for the analysis of the "What Should Be" data was a duplication of the procedure described in the previous section of this article. The procedures were: Alpha Factor Analysis; Varimax rotation of factors with eigenvalues $>$ 1.00 to determine factor scale scores; two-way analyses of variances; Post Hoc tests; and T-test of Correlated Means.

There were seven factors isolated from the ideal data with eigenvalues $\geq$ 1.00 (Table VIII); the largest factor accounted for 41.4% of the total variance generated by the instrument. All seven factors generated a total of 77.2% of the variance - these factors were stronger than the eight factors generated under the present ("What Is") condition (refer to Table I). A varimax rotation was then applied to seven factors to isolate and identify orthogonal factors (Table IX).

Insert Tables VIII and IX About Here

Using factor loadings of .40 and above, seven orthogonal factors were named (Tables IX, X). The major factor (Factor 1) accounted for 56.9% of the total variance generated by the rotated factors; this factor was a general factor comprising routine practices, procedures, and evaluation elements and was titled as such. A General Administrative/Organization/Reporting Factor (Factor 2) was the second most important isolated factor, and it accounted for 12.2% of the variance. Factor 3 was titled Structure of Field Experience and accounted for 9.7% of the variance, while Factors 4 (Determining College Personnel) 5 (Site/Staff/Observation Selection), 6 (Remuneration), and 7 (Observation Credit) accounted for 7.4%, 5.7%, 4.5%, and 3.6% of the variance respectively.

Insert Table X About Here

Scale scores were then calculated (as previously described) for each respondent. These scores were then used as dependent variables in subsequent analyses. The means, by groups, of the factors (as determined from scale scores) are displayed in Table XI. The largest mean for the present ("What Is") condition of the ideal factors was 2.0580 (Factor 1, K-12 Group), with all the other means below 2.0000. The largest mean for what should be the condition of the ideal factors was 3.2754 (Factor 1, K-12 Group), and except for Factors 6 and 7 of the Faculty ($\bar{X}$=1.6250, $\bar{X}$=1.8571) all the other means were between 2.0000 and 3.2754.

Insert Table XI About Here

There were no group differences across factors of how respondents viewed the present role of cooperating teachers with respect to the ideal factors (Table XII). However, the second level (repeated measures) of the two-way analysis of variance did isolate a highly significant F ratio (F=9.9443,

$p < .0001$). There was a significant interaction (Groups X Factors) as well - $F=1.7644$, $p = .032$. Post Hoc tests indicated that Factor 1 was significantly greater than Factors 2, 3, 5 and these, inturn, were significantly greater than 4, 6, and 7. The interaction was generated on Factor 4 by the K-12 Cooperating Teachers responding significantly higher (indicating more involvement) than Secondary and Elementary Cooperating teachers, while having almost similar views of those of the Faculty Group.

Insert Table XII About Here

The analysis of variance of the groups and factors on what should be the level of involvement in the ideal factors indicates no significant group differences or interactions (Table XIII), while there were significant factor differences ($F=4.2280$, $p < .001$). The factor differences can be attributed to Factors 1, 3 and 5 being significantly greater (i.e.: desiring more involvement) than Factor 6, which is greater than Factors 2, 7 and 4. The teacher groups and faculty appear to have similar, but not identical, views about the level of involvement in decision making that cooperating teachers should have with regard to the ideal factors. Respondents did feel that there should be more decision making involvement in Factor 1 (the major factor) than with the other factors. Again, the level of what should be the involvement was not high. The respondents indicated that there should be "some" rather than considerable or extensive involvement.

Insert Table XIII About Here

Analysis of the differences between what is the present level of involvement and what should be the level of involvement with the ideal factors indicate that each cooperating teacher group saw a significant need to increase involvement (Table XIV); significant increases occurred on each factor. Only the Faculty Group saw no need for cooperating teachers to increase

involvement in all seven areas. In fact, the faculty did not see a need to alter the involvement level on the first two factors (these factors had accounted for the major amount of variance accounted for by the rotated factors - a total of 69.1%).

Insert Table XIV About Here

COMPARISON OF FINDINGS WITH THE BUSH STUDY

Cooperating teachers from the Philadelphia area were the teacher subjects in the Bush Study (1975). The faculty came from the College of Education, Temple University. She used as her base for factor analysis the responses to the "What Is" (present) section of her instrument. Factor analysis with a varimax rotation were the general procedures used in the study. Therefore, comparisons between this study and the Bush Study is limited to the response base of what was perceived as the present ("What Is") condition of decision making involvement for cooperating teachers in the field experience.

Bush (1975: pp. 92-97) found nine factors whose eigenvalues were greater than the 1.00 Wilks' Lambda criteria. Factor One, generated 23.6% of the variance and Factor Two generated 11.2% of the variance. Each of the remaining seven factors generated less than 10% of the variance per factor (refer to Table XV). A total of 77.5% of variability was generated by the nine factors.

Insert Table XV About Here

When comparing the results found by Bush with those found in this study, it is interesting to note that there was one less factor generated by the cooperating teachers from the Omaha Metro Area (refer to Table I). Also, Bush found that the nine factors accounted for 77.5% of the variance while the eight factors found in this study generated 71.9%.

Closer inspection of the factor structures indicate that Factor 1 (General Administrative/Organization) is almost identical to Factors 1 and 2 in the Bush Study. Factor 1 & 2 in the Bush Study generated 34.8% of the variance, while factor one in this study generated 36.1%. Factor 2 in this study is an exact duplicate of Factor Three of the Bush Study. Factor Three in the Bush Study generated 9.8% of the variance while Factor Two generated 9.3%. The cumulative percent of variance generated by Factors 1, 2, and 3 in the Bush Study was 44.6, while the cumulative percent in this study for Factors One and Two was 45.4. The strongest factors in both studies were similar to each other.

All similarities between the remaining factors found in this study and the Bush Study end here. The remaining factors in both studies were quite different beyond those described above.

Although only three factors in the Bush Study were similar to the first two factors in this study, the means generated for all the factors in this study were almost identical to those generated by the urban teachers and college administrators surveyed by Bush. In both studies, for each of the groups, there were significant differences between respondents' role perceptions of "What Is" and "What Should Be" the role of cooperating teachers in the field experience - Bush, 1975: pp. 98-106. (The mean for each factor for "What Is" ranged from no involvement to slight involvement; the means for each factor for "What Should Be" ranged from slight involvement to some involvement - this was true for both studies).

DISCUSSION

One of the key purposes in this study was to gather information from cooperating teachers from a Mid-west medium size metropolitan community.

Specifically, the information gathered in the survey dealt with the perception of role (involvement) of these teachers in the design and operation of field experiences. Cooperating teachers have a role now (the "What Is") as do cooperating teachers everywhere, but did this population feel that this role was at an adequate level, or was there a need for increased involvement in field experiences (the "What Should Be") in terms of program design and allocation of control. Highly associated with this major purpose, the study was also designed to determine how collegiate counterparts viewed the present role of cooperating teachers. The authors were further interested in determining if geographic location had an influence on the role perceptions of cooperating teachers and compared the results of this investigation in the Mid-west with those of a study conducted in the urban Northeast.

A comparison between the "What Is" role of cooperating teachers and the "What Should Be" revealed that, indeed, there was a difference in perception of the present role and the desired level of that role involvement, but the difference was not great. For the areas available to cooperating teachers for participatory involvement, under present conditions, the results showed that the involvement was primarily in more perfunctory general administrative duties than in those areas which involve program design, and goal-setting and evaluation in field experiences. In this investigation, as in the Bush Study, it appeared from the data that a dramatic increase in involvement (as presently structured) of cooperating teachers in the development of field experiences in teacher education was not desired; and in terms of the two distinct geographic locations, no dramatic differences in role perceptions, or increases in the role perceptions were identified. The major factors were identical in both studies, therefore, it can be concluded that in the two regions of the country the role structure, as perceived by cooperating teachers, were quite similar.

In this study, under the present field experience structure, Secondary and Elementary Cooperating Teachers see their present respective roles as being about the same but less involved than K-12 Cooperating Teachers and the Faculty Group across all factors except one. For the college faculty group, respondents indicated that cooperating teachers have been given more involvement in field programs than Elementary and Secondary and K-12 teachers perceive it to be. K-12 teachers viewed their involvement to be higher than their Secondary and Elementary counterparts. (K-12 teachers specialize in the fields of Art, Music, Physical Education, and Library Science.) Their interaction with student teachers and tasks related to student teaching differ to a substantial degree from those of Secondary and Elementary Cooperating Teachers. This relationship and its interactions may have generated this difference.

Although there were differences among the various factors in terms of "What Should Be" the present role of cooperating teachers, all of the respondent groups appeared to have similar views as to the ideal state of the present involvement structure in the field experience. Respondents to the administrative factor did not view the degree of involvement to be as high as the other factors. In spite of the fact that the respondents saw a greater need to be involved than that which presently exists, they did not view the ideal state of all the factors (derived from the present condition) as requiring heavy involvement in the decision making aspects of field experiences. It is possible that cooperating teachers view their interaction with the college as being predetermined and/or unalterable in any significant degree under present circumstances which govern of field experiences - hence, the results.

Even when the data were reanalyzed to determine what should be the ideal state of role involvement, the results were quite similar to just what has been described. The present involvement of the ideal factors was low, and what should be the involvement in these factors, although significantly higher, only indicated a need for "some" rather than considerable or extensive involvement.

The main differences in the two analyses in this study were in the first major factor. Under present field experience structure, cooperating teachers identified general administrative organizational duties (Factor 1) as being most important and - with evaluation (Factor 3) and practices and procedures (Factor 5) relegated to very low status. When considering the ideal state, practices, procedures, and evaluation comprise the most significant factor (Factor 1) with general administrative organizational duties being less important (Factor 2).

Except for the K-12 Cooperating Teachers and Faculty responding higher than the other groups on a weak factor (4), the groups responded similarly to the ideal factors as they are presently implementated. Groups had similar views on what should be the state of the ideal factors. There appeared to be agreement among groups on the present and the should be state of the ideal factors, while these same groups were more varied on their perceptions of what is and should be the state of the factors generated under the present conditions of the field experience. It would appear that college supervisors do not see as great a need to increase the level of decision making involvement of cooperating teachers as do the teachers themselves. This was true whether the factors were generated under the present conditions or under ideal conditions.

If Career Education experiences are to be maximized for future teachers, than there is a need to change the attitude of cooperating teachers towards

the field experience as it is presently structured. That is, emphasis should be placed on content, subject matter, techniques, methodology, etc. that cooperating teachers see as their role, rather than as a provider of a "place" to have the field experience. They see a need to be more "professional". This should be translated into content and techniques. Also, this might mean a place where "issues" are discussed and minds are expanded.

The data indicates that the "care and feeding" of pre-service teachers (would-be teachers) is not high on the priority list for classroom teachers. This could be a function of teachers' priorities for "their students" rather than for university students. Thus, Career Education experiences are going to be limited by the priorities set by cooperating teachers and limited as a function of the relationship set by university supervisors with such cooperating teachers. The university supervisor will have to be out in the field more often and work closely with cooperating teachers. In addition, the university supervisor will enhance the decision-making options of the cooperating teacher. If not, the student teacher will not benefit from the wide range of possibilities that could be offered to him/her in the field experience. All the model programs out of NIE, HEW, etc., will have little effect in the field experience without the support of the cooperating teacher focusing on "professional" activities and placing higher priorities on the field experience. The Career Education models are rarely implemented to the letter in the field, and where they are fully "on-line" only a few fortunate student teachers will benefit (only those at the site). Thus, we must look towards the cooperating teacher and the field experience for support....if the cooperating teacher is mildly concerned with teacher pre-service preparation, than what are the options available to those involved in Career Education training to provide a meaningful and worthwhile experience?

In short, it may be concluded from the data that the role in field experiences that cooperating teachers see for themselves should involve an increase in all components, but, that increase is not dramatically greater (althought statistically significant) than their perception of current levels of input. Respondents focused on tasks somewhat removed from serious decision making contributions under the present structure, however, they focus on more "professional tasks" under ideal conditions. College faculty feel that cooperating teacher input is greater than teachers' perceptions of that input. Further, the college faculty do not feel that the cooperating teacher's role should increase in most areas.

If student teaching is the most important component in the pre-service education of teachers, and the cooperating teacher is so closely involved with that component, perhaps means of altering their relatively repressed views about their present role in the field experience should be given more attention. There is a need to capitalize and build on the idealized role of the cooperating teacher, so that this role and the present role perceptions are congruent. The vehicle for change, as well as the key areas of concern in the field experience, are worthy of careful consideration by all those who are responsible for the design and administration of such programs - this includes both the professionals in teacher preparation programs and the professionals in the classroom.

REFERENCES

Armor, D. J. "Theta Reliability and Factor Scaling." In H. L. Costner (Ed.), Sociological Methodology: 1973-1974. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Bush, Ann G. The Cooperating Teacher's Role in Decision-making Within the Elementary Student Teaching Field Program at Temple University as Perceived by Cooperating Teachers and College of Education Administrators. Unpublished Dissertation, Temple University, 1975.

Clothier, Grant and Kingsley E. Enriching Student Teaching Relationships (Cooperating Teacher Edition). Shawnee Mission: Midwest Educational Training and Research Organization, 1973.

Copeland, Willis D. "Some Factors Related to Student Teacher Classroom Performance Following Microteaching Training." American Educational Research Journal, Spring, 1977, Volume 14, No. 2, pp. 147-157.

Cottrell, D. P. "An Open Conversation on Teacher Education." Theory into Practice, 1974, XIII, 198-208.

Dressel, F. B. "Teaching: Student Teaching - - The Public School's Responsibility." School and Society, 1970, 98, 163-164.

DuBey, Robert E., Endly, V. L., Roe, B. D., and Tollett, D. J. A Performance Guide to Student Teaching (2nd edition). Danville: The Interstate Printers & Publishers, Inc., 1975.

Higgins, A. S. "Teacher Education in the University." Educational Forum, 1971, 36. 73-79.

Horton, Lowell. "The Preparation of Cooperating Teachers: A Proposal." ATE Newsletter, 1977, X, No. 6, 4 +.

Huntley, A. Student Teaching: Partnership, Power Play, Or Power Shift? Harrisburg, Pennsylvania Conference: The Pennsylvania, PACTE, 1973.

Kaiser, H. F. "The Varimax Criterion for Analytical Rotation in Factor Analysis." Psychometrika, 1958, pp. 187-200.

Knipsel, M. "What Can Be Done?" Theory Into Practice, 1974, XIII, 218-221.

Nie, N.; Hull, C. H.; Jenkins, L.; Steinbrenner, K.; and Bent, D. H. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (2nd edition). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Perrodin, Alex F. The Student Teacher's Reader. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1966.

Sadler, Edward J. A Survey of Secondary Education Student Teachers. Unpublished Research Report. University of Nebraska at Omaha, 1974.

Scheffé, Henry. The Analysis of Variance. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1969.

Southworth, H. C. "Teacher Education for the Middle School: A Framework." Theory Into Practice, 1968, 3, 123-128.

Terenzini, P. T. and Pascarella, E. T. "An Assessment of the Construct Validity of the Clark-Trow Typology of College Student Subcultures." American Educational Research Journal, Summer, 1977, Volumes 14, No. 3, pp. 225-248.

Tom, A. R. "Three Dilemas: School-University Ventures." Clearing House, 1973, 48, 7-10.

Toney, M. M. and Dieterle, L. E. Working With The Prospective Teacher. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt Publishing Co., 1976.

Wayson, N. W. "Developing the Teachers of Teachers." Theory Into Practice, 1974, XIII, 177-186.

Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design (2nd edition). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

TABLE I

Alpha Factors Based on "What Is"
N-141 - all teachers

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variance	Cumulative Percent
1	11.5464	36.1	36.1
2	2.9847	9.3	45.4
3	1.8948	5.9	51.3
4	1.7846	5.6	56.9
5	1.4811	4.6	61.5
6	1.2027	3.8	65.3
7	1.0733	3.4	68.6
8	1.0374	3.2	71.9

TABLE II

Varimax Rotated Alpha Factors Based on "What Is" (Present)

	Instrument Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	h^2
1.	Goals and Objectives Development	.15646	-.03530	.03931	.68849*[a]	.01437	.04042	.12486	-.15574	.54312
2.	Course Selecting	.05410	.08139	.06473	.75200*	-.11768	.40917	-.03755	.19336	.79860
3.	Course Concurrent	.30923	.01805	.31609	.59108*	-.01813	.08256	.13380	.20384	.61188
4.	Class Observation Credit	.29172	.01541	.25186	.68231*	-.00334	.01869	.20133	-.02349	.65577
5.	Competency Appraisal	.19287	.08803	.44987*	.31821	.20356	.11277	.28366	.13258	.50078
6.	Completion Success	.13198	.24140	.47917*	.22666	.13289	.02203	.27472	.15265	.47360
7.	Final Grade	.07721	.28429	.58366*	.10622	.07808	.20684	.06463	-.12875	.50827
8.	Adequacy of School	.19525	.16327	.68766*	.10433	.17932	-.01611	-.02133	.06043	.58506
9.	Evaluating Field Program	.12761	.03872	.19199	.29359	.26986	.56648*	.35472	.02653	.66104
10.	Determining Field Experience	.27670	.06265	.10752	.16611	.11914	.60663*	.02303	.01365	.50284
11.	Determining Number of Hours	.21480	.05136	.51762*	.02654	.26023	.09653	.26193	-.14288	.48355
12.	Teaching Load	.10884	.04735	.02176	-.09523	.68628*	.16503	.05518	-.07358	.53021
13.	Extra Class Activities	.05398	.18005	.16872	-.00739	.65806*	.00498	.04708	.15198	.52227
14.	Attendance	.01371	.17795	.23612	.02994	.66702*	.02510	.04492	-.05814	.53945
15.	Numbers Assigned to Supervisors	.39114	.17295	.47187*	.19410	.02014	.04421	.04249	.16091	.47330
16.	Criteria for Selection of Student Teachers	.39999	.27015	.22767	.22659	-.05426	.14164	.36193	-.08299	.49708
17.	Criteria for Selection of Schools	.33415	.14252	.17142	.13638	.03757	.04066	.78223*	.10358	.80546
18.	Remuneration for Participation	.76795*	.09523	.43833	.45993	.15770	.15426	.41492	.07750	1.22933

TABLE II (continued) Varimax Rotated Alpha Factors Based on "What Is" (Present)

	Instrument Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	h^2
19.	Qualifications of Cooperating Teachers	.42023	.01671	.14116	.16358	.15606	.20711	.57153*	-.13266	.63509
20.	Qualifications of Supervisors	.54011*	-.05578	.38949	.12592	.15583	.17468	.45375	.18066	.75572
21.	Qualification of Field Placement Director	.50455	.07751	.18930	.19402	.02221	.12494	.39115	.51555*	.76903
22.	Developing Observation and Conference Techniques	.27235	.44691*	.10537	.14635	.10372	.02621	.12264	-.29296	.41869
23.	Orientation in Classroom	.10432	.68157*	.14320	-.02449	.08999	.04074	-.02994	-.02458	.50786
24.	Orientation to School-Community	.11261	.91597*	.12283	-.02090	.13460	-.01736	.11000	.11452	.91053
25.	Involvement in School-Community Activities	.10046	.66035*	.21458	-.01118	.20410	.07865	.07643	.07498	.55172
26.	Courses Following Field Experiences	.21950	.23650	-.03344	.15982	.28116	-.16449	.32836	.03298	.34590
27.	Public Relations	.63725*	.54296	.02404	.18338	.17435	-.01588	.19375	-.20324	.84456
28.	Publications	.86976*	.16514	.28094	.14848	-.01693	.12319	.13739	.31189	1.01630
29.	Formal Reports and Research	.63537*	.08598	.35356	.11385	.06943	.09562	.11001	.00275	.57513
30.	Follow-up Studies	.73738*	.17320	.09780	.25510	.01883	.01798	.27635	-.08450	.73259
31.	Placement for Graduates	.41529*	.20380	.08884	.04485	.34876	.11979	.09228	-.11497	.38164
32.	In-service for Cooperating Teachers	.70174*	.18099	.06253	.16527	.24233	.20718	.18791	.00675	.69342

[a] Asterisked Loadings indicate variables used to compute factor scales for each scale

TABLE III

Varimax Rotated Alpha Factors (Based on "What Is")

Factors	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variance	Cumulative Percent
1. General Administrative/Organizational	17.5159	54.7	54.7
2. Orientation/Preparation	4.2792	13.4	68.1
3. Evaluation	2.5093	7.8	76.0
4. Structure	2.3346	7.3	83.2
5. Routine Practices/Procedures	1.7913	5.6	88.8
6. Field Program Design	1.3872	4.3	93.2
7. Site/Staff Selection	1.1193	3.5	96.7
8. Field Director Relations	1.0635	3.3	100.0

TABLE IV

Means for Eight Rotated Alpha Factors for Cooperating Teacher Groups and Faculty Under Two Conditions [a]

Rotated Factors	Secondary Education		K-12		Elementary Education		Faculty	
	IS	SHOULD BE	IS	SHOULD BE	IS	SHOULD BE	IS	SHOULD BE
1. (Adm./Org.)	1.2153	2.1635	1.4375	2.7813	1.2279	2.2292	1.4286	2.4643
2. (Orient./Prep.)	1.9621	3.1094	1.9554	3.0926	1.9850	3.0600	2.5938	3.3056
3. (Evaluation)	1.5758	3.0059	1.8333	3.2333	1.4129	2.7500	1.7381	2.6190
4. (Structure)	1.4257	2.7803	1.2931	2.7222	1.2926	2.5896	1.2857	2.3889
5. (Pract./Proced.)	2.1667	3.3524	3.1458	3.7576	2.5818	3.3506	2.1250	2.7083
6. (Prog. Design)	1.2632	2.7143	1.4531	2.8235	1.5273	2.8860	1.5625	2.3889
7. (Site/Staff)	1.2778	2.9706	1.3750	2.8276	1.1273	2.5686	1.6667	2.6111
8. (Direct. Relat.)	1.0000	1.7667	1.1818	1.9655	1.0192	1.6200	1.0000	1.7778

[a] Factors based on the "What Is" (Present) responses

TABLE V

Analysis of Variance for Groups and Factors on Present Cooperating Teachers' Role [a]

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean S.S.	F	P
Mean	695.88428	1	695.88428		
Groups (A)	14.6887	3	4.8962	4.8604	.006
Error	37.2732	37	1.0073		
Factors (B)	48.5699	7	6.9385	20.5168	<.0001
Interactions (A & B)	21.5380	21	1.0256	3.0326	<.0001
Error	87.5910	259	0.3381		

[a] Dependent variables are the factors derived from the factor analysis on the "What Is" response base.

TABLE VI

Analysis of Variance for Groups and Factors on "What Should Be" the Role of Cooperating Teachers [a]

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean S.S.	F.	P.
Mean	1777.8774	1	1777.8774		
Groups (A)	11.4010	3	3.8003	1.1019	.3630
Error	106.91281	31	3.4488		
Factors (B)	55.4331	7	7.9190	21.3037	<.0001
Interactions (A & B)	10.2222	21	0.4867	1.3095	.1710
Error	80.66309	217	0.3717		

[a] Dependent variables are the factors derived from the factor analysis on the "What Is" response base.

TABLE VII

T-test of Correlated Means on "What Is" and "What Should Be" by Groups on Eight Rotated Factors.[a]

Factors	Secondary Education		K-12		Elementary Education		Faculty	
	t-value	p	t-value	p	t-value	p	t-value	p
1. (Adm./Org.)	4.55	< .0001	5.50	<.0001	6.31	< .0001	2.92	.027
2. (Orient./Prep.)	8.01	< .0001	7.06	<.0001	8.77	< .0001	1.62	n.s.
3. (Evaluation)	11.79	< .0001	7.46	<.0001	12.32	< .0001	2.86	.029
4. (Structure)	9.32	< .0001	8.39	<.0001	11.46	< .0001	3.06	.002
5. (Pract./Proced.)	8.09	< .0001	3.64	.001	6.99	< .0001	1.53	n.s.
6. (Prog. Design)	10.87	< .0001	8.09	<.0001	9.94	< .0001	1.84	n.s.
7. (Site/Staff)	9.41	< .0001	6.05	<.0001	8.52	< .0001	1.06	n.s.
8. (Direct. Relat.)	99.00	< .0001	3.78	.001	4.03	< .0001	99.00	<.0001

[a] Dependent variables are the factors derived from the factor analysis on the "What Is" response base.

TABLE VIII

Alpha Factors Based on Ideal ("What Should Be") Condition

N - 141 - All Teachers

Factors	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variance	Cumulative Percent
1	13.26015	41.4	41.4
2	3.11628	9.7	51.2
3	2.52498	7.9	59.1
4	1.88848	5.9	65.0
5	1.53223	4.8	69.8
6	1.28432	4.0	73.8
7	1.11197	3.5	77.2

TABLE IX

Varimax Rotated Alpha Factors Based on "What Should Be" (Ideal)

Instrument Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	h^2
1. Goals and Objectives Development	.11971	.14914	.65416*	.13894	.10634	.07702	.01051	.5 :30
2. Course Selecting	.25644	.19445	.76372*	.21796	.13870	-.08506	.14758	.78251
3. Course Concurrent	.60384*[a]	.04675	.51025	.28875	.06378	-.21048	.11121	.77123
4. Class Observation Credit	.15830	-.00689	.33777	.13129	.08282	-.17247	.56798*	.51656
5. Competency Appraisal	.48504*	.27726	.37642	.28696	.22423	-.13674	.07384	.61058
6. Completion Success	.22493	.28047	.16036	.62670*	.15270	-.04406	.24472	.63271
7. Final Grade	.60154*	-.06358	.35283	.12329	.21869	.18917	.22266	.63873
8. Adequacy of School	.04589	.42327	.59025*	.39531	.07257	.10363	.15498	.72587
9. Evaluating Field Program	.26603	.34472	.63621*	.18564	.34613	.28090	.15980	.85301
10. Determining Field Experience	.40344*	.34377	.36731	.36762	.29091	.37163	-.05508	.77671
11. Determining Number of Hours	.82947*	.10827	.23967	.13014	.23107	-.02377	.08732	.83569
12. Teaching Load	.82036*	.11624	.15775	.17369	.11886	.16933	.06599	.78878
13. Extra Class Activities	.84307*	.34806	.18501	.07470	-.02306	.07351	-.01302	.87782
14. Attendance	.90993*	.15956	-.13509	-.11546	.10635	.03945	.12857	.91419
15. Numbers Assigned to Supervisors	.06642	-.07383	.34245	.74352*	.06145	.20541	.00846	.72610
16. Criteria for Selection of Student Teachers	.47343*	.12908	.22729	.31391	.25365	.29441	.12698	.55803
17. Criteria for Selection of Schools	.38610	.08989	.25705	.26211	.59237*	.10973	.09413	.66374
18. Remuneration for Participation	.06153	.08009	-.01716	.19136	.04392	.69990*	-.10762	.55127
19. Qualifications of Cooperating Teachers	.08204	.01890	.14997	.14694	.66737*	.06623	.02478	.50189

TABLE IX (continued) Varimax Rotated Alpha Factors Based on "What Should Be" (Ideal)

	Instrument Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	h^2
20.	Qualifications of Supervisors	.31473	.26816	.30989	.46801*	.33810	.07139	.02502	.60606
21.	Qualification of Field Placement Director	.02834	.26056	.17673	.66457*	.19790	.34032	.02880	.69732
22.	Developing Observation and Conference Techniques	.42112	.22873	-.00312	.39541	.53568*	-.11843	.09567	.69598
23.	Orientation in Classroom	.33987	.55477*	-.08447	-.00802	.33847	-.09429	.26637	.62512
24.	Orientation to School-Community	.08695	.84158*	.07208	.06565	.08605	.14123	.34265	.87049
25.	Involvement in School-Community Activities	.09019	.75544*	.10496	.16724	-.24738	-.00532	.08585	.68456
26.	Courses Following Field Experiences	.17261	.43639	.04216	.48484*	.36953	.12986	-.19560	.64857
27.	Public Relations	.13808	.63971*	.27669	.09827	.51334	.25212	-.02534	.84216
28.	Publications	.30451	.66780*	.34253	.29214	.22920	-.01908	-.27200	.86822
29.	Formal Reports and Research	.25479	.66263*	.35151	.03461	.30389	.00655	-.22122	.77014
30.	Follow-up Studies	.28125	.55247*	.37321	-.10140	.44675	-.26788	-.09066	.81336
31.	Placement for Graduates	.09276	.72584*	.05848	.38214	.09865	.01062	-.32398	.79957
32.	In-service for Cooperating Teachers	.07568	.54955*	.26115	.08826	.04033	.33936	-.01649	.50078

[a] Asterisked loadings indicate variables used to compute factor scales for each scale.

TABLE X

Varimax Rotated Alpha Factors (Based on Ideal/"What Should Be" Condition)

Factors	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variance	Cumulative Percent
1. Routine Prac./Procedure and Evaluation	18.19543	56.9	56.9
2. General Admin./Organization/Reporting	3.90717	12.2	69.1
3. Structure of Field Experience	3.09141	9.7	78.7
4. Determining College Personnel	2.37506	7.4	86.2
5. Site/Staff/Observation Selection	1.82987	5.7	91.9
6. Remuneration	1.43633	4.5	96.4
7. Observation Credit	1.16320	3.6	100.0

TABLE XI

Means for Seven Rotated Alpha Factors for Cooperating Teacher Groups and Faculty Under Two Conditions[a]

Rotated Factors	Secondary Education		K-12		Elementary Education		Faculty	
	IS	SHOULD BE	IS	SHOULD BE	IS	SHOULD BE	IS	SHOULD BE
1. Routine Practices/ Procedures in Classroom and Evaluation	1.7817	3.1429	2.0580	3.2754	1.7806	2.9055	1.8056	2.5972
2. General Administration and Organization/Reporting and Research	1.4251	2.4396	1.6111	2.4444	1.5198	2.4722	1.9841	2.9048
3. Structure Determination of Field Experiences	1.5469	2.9766	1.5192	3.1923	1.5125	2.9312	1.5625	2.6875
4. Determining qualifications of College Personnel	1.1238	2.1524	1.6714	2.6143	1.1812	2.1250	1.4000	2.5200
5. Site/Staff/Observation Technique Selection	1.5287	3.0805	1.6420	2.9383	1.3406	2.6594	1.8889	2.5556
6. Determining Remuneration	1.3158	2.6842	1.3889	2.8889	1.1667	2.7222	1.2500	1.6250
7. Class Observation	1.4286	2.7714	1.2414	2.2069	1.1132	2.2264	1.0000	1.8571

[a] Factors based on the "What Should Be" (Ideal) responses

TABLE XII

Analysis of Variance for Groups and Factors
on Present ("What Is") Cooperating Teachers' Role[a]

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean S.S.	F	P
Mean	421.4287	1	421.4287		
Groups (A)	5.4243	3	1.8081	1.8252	.161
Error	33.6814	34	0.9906		
Factors (B)	9.1766	6	1.5294	9.9443	<.0001
Interactions (A X B)	4.8845	18	0.2714	1.7644	.032
Error	31.3751	204	0.1538		

[a] Dependent variables are the factors derived from the factor analysis on the "What Should Be" (Ideal) response base.

TABLE XIII

Analysis of Variance for Groups and Factors on "What Should Be" The Role of Cooperating Teachers [a]

Source	Sum of Squares	D.F.	Mean S.S.	F	P
Mean	1401.2207	1	1401.2207		
Groups (A)	4.7143	3	1.5714	0.5560	.648
Error	79.1339	28	2.8262		
Factors (B)	15.4029	6	2.5672	4.2280	.001
Interactions (A X B)	17.1269	18	0.9515	1.5671	.074
Error	102.0070	168	0.6072		

[a] Dependent variables are the factors derived from the factor analysis on The "What Should Be" (Ideal) response base.

TABLE XIV

T-Test of Correlated Means on "What Is" and "What Should Be" by Groups on Seven Rotated Factors[a]

Factors	Secondary Education		K-12		Elementary Education		Faculty	
	t-value	p	t-value	p	t-value	p	t-value	p
.. (Routine Prac./ Procedure and Evaluation)	12.08	<.0001	8.18	<.0001	11.18	<.0001	2.33	n.s.
². (General Admin/ Organization/ Reporting)	6.86	<.0001	6.11	<.0001	8.35	<.0001	2.36	n.s.
³. (Structure of Field Experience)	11.57	<.0001	8.83	<.0001	13.28	<.0001	2.93	.022
⁴. (Determining College Personnel)	6.85	<.0001	4.87	<.0001	7.60	<.0001	4.11	.015
⁵. (Site/Staff/ Observation Selection)	8.41	<.0001	8.08	<.0001	8.81	<.0001	0.93	n.s.
⁶. (Remuneration)	3.71	.002	4.60	<.0001	5.10	<.0001	2.05	n.s.
⁷. (Observation Credit)	6.69	<.0001	4.79	<.0001	7.59	<.0001	99.00	<.0001

[a] Dependent variables are the factors derived from the factor analysis on the "What Should Be" (Ideal) response base.

TABLE XV

Factors Generated in the Bush Study (1975, p. 92-97)[a]

Factors	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variance	Cumulative Percent
1. Personal Qual./In-service Prog./Budget Policies	7.54807	23.6	23.6
2. Documents & Reports	3.58498	11.2	34.8
3. Supervisory Functions	3.12998	9.8	44.6
4. Program Policies & Standards	2.68858	8.4	53.0
5. Course Selection	2.11515	6.6	59.6
6. Prog. Eval/Employ. Opportunity	1.70737	5.3	64.9
7. Teacher Ed. St. Eval.	1.52306	4.8	69.7
8. Prog. Goals & Eval.	1.42606	4.5	74.1
9. Policies: Att., Punct. Post Exper.	1.06359	3.3	77.5

[a] Factors generated from the "What Is" (Present) response base only.